

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated June 16, 2003, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Taylor et al. of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,398 ("Taylor"). Claims 1-2, 6-7, and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sakamoto of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,923 ("Sakamoto"). Claims 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Taylor. Claims 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto and Taylor in view of Motomura of U.S. Patent No. 6,347,055 ("Motomura").

In this response, claims 22 and 24 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-9 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-9, 21, and 23 remain pending. Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Taylor. Claims 1-2, 6-7, and 31-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sakamoto.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-9, 21, and 23, as amended, include the limitations that are not disclosed by Taylor or Sakamoto. In particular, independent claim 1 includes a memory device that includes a wait control logic coupled to a processor, a main memory, and a cache memory, where the wait control logic signals the processor, if data currently requested is not in the cache memory, to indicate that the requested data is not ready to be read, and the wait control logic signals the processor to indicate that the requested data is

ready to be read on a next processor cycle, if the requested data is in the cache memory.

These limitations are absent from Taylor or Sakamoto. Therefore, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited references.

Independent claim 6 includes limitations similar to those claimed in claim 1.

Therefore for reasons similar to those discussed above, claim 6 is not anticipated by the cited references.

Given that claims 2-3 and 21 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 2-3 and 21 are not anticipated by Taylor or Sakamoto. Given that claims 7 and 23 depend from claim 6, Applicant submits that claims 7 and 23 are not anticipated by Taylor or Sakamoto.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Taylor. Claims 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto and Taylor in view of Motomura.

Applicant submits that, similar to Taylor and Sakamoto, Motomura also fails to disclose or suggest the limitations set forth above. There is no suggestion in Taylor, Sakamoto, and Motomura for combining Taylor and Sakamoto with Motomura. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on Applicant's own disclosure, to combine Taylor and Sakamoto with Motomura. Even if they were combined, such a combination would still lack the limitations of a wait control logic coupled to the processor, the main memory, and the cache memory to signal the processor that the requested data is not ready to read if the requested data is not in the cache memory, and to signal the processor that the requested data

is ready to be read upon a next processor cycle if the requested is in the cache memory.

Therefore, at least for the reasons similar to those discussed above, claims 1-9, 21, and 23 are patentable over the cited references.

### CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that applicable rejections and objections have been overcome.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 9/16, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin G. Shao  
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300